Bay nutrient criteria and p letter also makes a number bias and scientific miscond	's Office has asked me to re ermit development be trans r of very serious allegations duct underlie the Region's s initiated a careful review	sferred to an independent s against Region I, include actions." Because of the	panel of experts for r ling that "regulatory v seriousness of these	eview. Your violations,
				2
omics of home breakers some	a vertos ai baurregen se ^a bas	on het proble stemper	gentlater was des	en amunication
	Marine and an inter-	an gwann was growengan w	in control of the same	- and he

You further raise questions about peer review. In March 2010 the NH DES requested a peer review of the nutrient targets through EPA's Nutrient Scientific Technical Exchange Partnership and Support (N-STEPS) program. As you know, N-STEPS is administered through a contract funded by EPA. The reviewers selected by EPA's contractor were Dr. Robert Howarth from Cornell University and Dr. Walter Boynton from the University of Maryland. Both reviewers have national expertise in the field of marine eutrophication and had no involvement in the development of the NH DES criteria. Neither Region I nor the Office of Water had a role in selecting the reviewers. The reviewers had access to all comments provided to NH DES during the public comment period described above, including those of the affected municipalities.

OMB's "Final Information Quality Bulletin for Peer Review" (Dec 16, 2004) says,

Peer review involves the review of a draft product for quality by specialists in the field who were not involved in producing the draft. The peer reviewer's report is an evaluation or critique that is used by the authors of the draft to improve the product. Peer review typically evaluates the clarity of hypotheses, the validity of the research design, the quality of data collection procedures, the robustness of the methods employed, the appropriateness of the methods for the hypotheses being tested, the extent to which the conclusions follow from the analysis, and the strengths and limitations of the overall product.



In sum, u.e. enals as of your before and exhibits leads as to conclude that your allegations of scientific measurements by Region I are not solutionisted. We aspect come request that further review of Great Bay entury marries be withdrawn from the Region. As you are well assure, if any recipient of a NPDES permit from before the final decision is in every there as well established procedure for secking review before the free free from mental. Appends Board.

Investment yets senters action accusations you have leveled against Region I and the liberty you have taken with the lager in consequencing your argument, we believe your letter has very little to do with the defense of selection integrity and more to do with medifies and homoget attacks on the Region's staff in an apparent effect to discust them from their efforts to restore the Great Bay extract. We conclude that it is in the best integrets of the Agency to Steiner the air and we have asked the haspector General to determine whether your assertions ment any bother meetings for